

REMARKS

Claims 5, 6 and 16 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 5-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Furusawa et al (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0232128). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present application claims priority to Japanese Patent Application No. 2002-287453 filed September 30, 2002. Applicant perfected this claim of foreign priority by filing an English translation of Application No. 2002-287453 on May 16, 2005 along with a statement that the translation is accurate. Accordingly, the present application is entitled to the foreign priority date of September 30, 2002.

Furusawa was filed on April 17, 2003 and published on December 18, 2003. Inasmuch as the present application has a perfected foreign priority date of September 30, 2002 (prior to the April 17, 2003 filing date of Furusawa), Furusawa does not qualify as prior art under 35 USC 102(e). Accordingly, reconsideration and withdraw of this rejection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5-6 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiguchi et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,599,582) in view of Miyamoto et al

(U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0015800). Claims 5-6 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiguchi et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,599,582) in view of Duineveld et al (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0060518). Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Furusawa et al (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0232128) in view of Kiguchi et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,599,582). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to item 4 in the office action, please note that the invention according to all of the claims was commonly owned.

Claim 5 calls for a device for forming a wiring comprising a liquid drop ejecting device for ejecting liquid drops onto a substrate by scanning on the substrate in at least first and second scanning movements. Claim 5 also calls for the volume of the liquid drops ejected in the first scanning movement to be equal to the volume of the liquid drops ejected in the second scanning movement. Applicant respectfully submits that this subject matter is not disclosed nor suggested by the cited art.

In particular, none of Kiguchi et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,599,582) nor Miyamoto et al (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0015800), Duineveld et al (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0060518) or Furusawa et al (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0232128) teach or suggest that the liquid drops ejected in a first scanning movement are equal to the volume of liquid drops ejected in a second scanning movement. Further, as stated above, Furusawa does not qualify as prior art. Accordingly, Claim 5, as well as Claims 6 and 16 depending therefrom, should be allowable over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov 22, 2006

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GGS/BEW/pvd]